

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/070,867	03/12/2002	Maria Giuseppina Martini	IT 010006	2617	
7590 01/20/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Philips Electronics North America Corporation			WAMSLEY,	WAMSLEY, PATRICK G	
Corporate Pater	nt Counsel	•		.	
580 White Plains Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Tarrytown, NY 10591			2819		

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A 10 // 3				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/070,867	MARTINI ET AL.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
i	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Patrick G Wamsley	2819				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 06 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the control of	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in			
	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancell NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:		•				
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-13.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appl	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. □ Other:						

. ..

- . . .

11 04400004

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Application No.

Continuation of 5.

The examiner maintains the enablement rejection. The examiner is not convinced by applicant's arguments because they do not address the critical problem with the claims. Instead of a "single" length field, the disclosed data structure seems to have a plurality of fields. See Figure 6, for example, a drawing that displays three length fields [If]. Also see lines 15-16 of page 2. Until this issue is resolved, the claims cannot be properly evaluated against the prior art of record.

Other problems:

Page 9, line 5: "start codes substitution" Page 10, line 7: "can fast and easily be"

Claim 11, line 7: "field information" instead of -- information field --